

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/667,655	ELLIOTT, NYLE S.
	Examiner Adam Marcketich	Art Unit 3761

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Adam Marcketich. (3) Chris McDonnell.
 (2) Tatyana Zalukaeva, Ph.D.. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 09 January 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,9 and 21-23.

Identification of prior art discussed: Brady (US Patent 6,723,040) and Millot (US Patent 6,171,289).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

TATYANA ZALUKAEVA
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Adam Marcketich
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argues that the use of a plug with a stoma would be detrimental for health reasons, and is therefore not practiced in the art. Examiner notes that this combination has not been found in the prior art.

Applicant further argues that combining the plug of Brady with the stoma pad of Millot would destroy the teaching of a conductivity sensor as taught by Millot.

Applicant's arguments are found persuasive regarding the combination of Millot in view of Brady, and the rejection will be withdrawn. .